

Appl. No. 10/711,882  
Amdt. dated March 29, 2006  
Reply to Office action of January 19, 2006

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

**1.Rejection of claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Liu et al. (US 5,864,459):**

**5 Response:**

Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Specifically, the limitation "the wafer carrier is attracted by an electrostatic chuck via the conducting layer" recited in original claim 7 has been added to claim 1. No new matter is entered.

10

Regarding US 5,864,459, Lu et al. teaches an electrostatic chuck including an electrode 10, and a dielectric layer 16 made of glass. Lu's electrode 10 and glass dielectric layer 16 may be interpreted as the conducting layer and the transparent base of claim 1, however, the newly added limitation is sufficient to differentiate claim 1 from Lu's teaching. According to claim 1, the wafer carrier is attracted by an electrostatic chuck, and therefore the wafer carrier functions as a carrying interface between the wafer and the electrostatic chuck. Specifically, the wafer carrier of claim 1 is not an electrostatic chuck, and the wafer carrier is  
15 incorporated between the wafer and the electrostatic chuck. On the other hand, what Lu teaches is an electrostatic chuck, which is not corresponding to the wafer carrier of the present application. Therefore, the amended claim 1 is patentably distinct from Lu's teaching, and should be allowed. Reconsideration of claim 1 is politely requested.

25

Claim 2 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claim 2 is therefore requested.

Appl. No. 10/711,882  
Amdt. dated March 29, 2006  
Reply to Office action of January 19, 2006

**2.Rejection of claims 1-3 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Van Elp et al. (US 2004/0012767):**

**5 Response:**

Regarding US 2004/0012767, Van Elp discloses an electrostatic chuck 200 including a core 230 made of glass, and an electrode 216 positioned on a bottom surface of the core 230. However, Van Elp fails to teach the limitation "the wafer carrier is attracted by an electrostatic chuck via the conducting layer" original recited in claim 7. The Examiner asserts that Van Elp discloses the limitation "the wafer carrier is attracted by an electrostatic chuck via the conducting layer" in [0009], lines4-6; [0068], lines12-15. However, what Van Elp teaches is a wafer, not a wafer carrier. Therefore, Van Elp teaches using an electrostatic chuck to transfer a wafer, and he fails to teach using a wafer carrier or like device which can be disposed between the wafer and the electrostatic chuck. Thus, the amended claim 1 is distinct from Van Elp's teaching, and should be allowed. Reconsideration of claim 1 is politely requested.

Claims 2-3 and 7 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claims 2-3 is therefore requested.

**3.Rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Elp et al. in view of Suzuki et al. (US 2003/0029565):**

**Response:**

Claim 4 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is

Appl. No. 10/711,882  
Amdt. dated March 29, 2006  
Reply to Office action of January 19, 2006

found allowable. Reconsideration of claim 4 is therefore requested.

**4.Rejection of claims 8, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Elp et al.:**

5

**Response:**

Claims 8, 10 and 11 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claims 8, 10 and 11 is therefore requested.

10

**5.Rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Elp et al. in view of Bollen et al. (US 4,766,515):**

**Response:**

15

Claim 9 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claim 9 is therefore requested.

**6.Rejection of claims 5, 6, 12-14, 16-18 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Elp et al. in view of Strasbaugh et al. (US 2003/0134578):**

20

**Response:**

Claim 5 and 12 teach using a bonding layer positioned on a top surface of the wafer carrier for bonding the wafer and the transparent base together. Since Van Elp fails to teach any use of a carrier wafer, it is not possible for one ordinary skilled in the art to incorporate the bonding layer taught by Strasbaugh into a wafer carrier. Therefore, Claims 5 and 12 are patentably distinct from the cited prior arts, and should be allowed. Reconsideration

25

Appl. No. 10/711,882  
Amdt. dated March 29, 2006  
Reply to Office action of January 19, 2006

of claims 5 and 12 are politely requested.

Claim 6 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claim 6 is therefore requested.

5        Claims 13-14, 16-18 and 21 are dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 12 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claims 13-14, 16-18 and 21 is therefore requested.

7. Rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable  
10        over Van Elp et al. in view of Strasbaugh et al. and further in view of Suzuki et al.:

**Response:**

15        Claim 15 is dependent on claim 12, and should be allowed if claim 12 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claim 15 is therefore requested.

8. Rejection of claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Elp et al. in view of Strasbaugh et al. and further in view of Bollen et al.:

20

**Response:**

Claims 19-20 are dependent on claim 12, and should be allowed if claim 12 is found allowable. Reconsideration of claims 19-20 is therefore requested.

25

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/711,882  
Amdt. dated March 29, 2006  
Reply to Office action of January 19, 2006

Sincerely yours,



Date: 03.29.2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)